

Appl. No. 10/775,606
Examiner: AUDUONG, GENE NGHIA, Art Unit 2827
In response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005

Date: April 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 10113751

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. Responsive to the Office Action mailed on January 25, 2005 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Present Status of Application

Claims 1-6 are pending. Claim 1 is objected to for informalities. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ooishi (U.S. Patent No. 6,349,065).

In this paper, claim 1 is amended to overcome the objection cited by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ooishi. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the reasons as follow.

Ooishi does not teach or suggest a method of driving and testing a semiconductor memory device comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, entering a testing mode, selecting a plurality of word lines controlled by a driving line, and turning on the word lines, transferring a driving signal through the control lines to the word lines, as recited in the claim 1.

MPEP 2131 prescribes that to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. In this regard, the Federal Circuit has held:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros.*

Appl. No. 10/775,606
Examiner: AUDUONG, GENE NGHIA, Art Unit 2827
In response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005

Date: April 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 10113751

v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 recites a method of driving and testing a semiconductor memory device, wherein the semiconductor memory device comprises a plurality of word lines and corresponding driving circuits, and each driving circuit is controlled by a control line and a driving line, comprising the steps of:

- entering a testing mode, selecting a plurality of word lines controlled by a driving line;
- enabling control lines corresponding to the plurality of word lines;
- enabling the driving line; and
- turning on the word lines, transferring a driving signal through the control lines to the word lines.

Ooishi teaches a semiconductor memory device allowing acceleration testing and a semi-integrated product for an integrated semiconductor device that allows acceleration testing. In column 13, lines 29-42 of Ooishi, the operation of the test mode is described as follows:

In test mode, ground potential GND is supplied to multi-selection pad 20, whereby multi-selection signal generation circuit 21 provides a multi-selection signal MLT of an H level. This multi-selection signal MLT is applied to row predecoder 121 and row decoder units RD1-RDn in row decoder 12. In response to multi-selection signal MLT of an H level, row predecoder 121 activates all predecode signals X1-X8 to an H level irrespective of row address signals RA1, /RA1-RA4, /RA4. In response to multi-selection signal MLT of an H level, row decoder units RD1-RDn activate all decode signals D1-Dn to an H level irrespective of row address signals RA5, /RA5-RA8, /RA8. **Therefore, all word drivers WD11-WD14, WD21-WD24, and WDn1-WDn4 are activated, whereby all word lines WL are driven.** [emphasis added]

Appl. No. 10/775,606
Examiner: AUDUONG, GENE NGHIA, Art Unit 2827
In response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005

Date: April 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 10113751

Thus, Ooishi teaches that all word lines are driven by all the drivers, according to the multi-selection signal MLT in the test mode, rather than entering a testing mode and selecting a plurality of word lines controlled by a driving line.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites a driving signal is transferred to the word lines through the control lines. However, Ooishi teaches that the drivers are controlled by the control lines. Ooishi fails to teach or suggest that a driving signal is transferred to the word lines through the control lines connected to a testing unit.

As Ooishi does not teach or suggest the steps of selecting a plurality of word lines controlled by a driving line or transferring a driving signal to the word lines through the control lines, as recited in the claim 1, it is Applicant's belief that the claim is allowable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, it is applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance. Furthermore, as it is Applicant's belief that claims 2-6 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, the Examiner's arguments in connection with these claims are considered moot and will not be addressed here.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson A. Quintero
Reg. No. 52,143
Customer No. 34,283
Telephone: (310) 401-6180

P110059NAQ